R0.035
S92 0035

OLSEN

SPECIAL PROJECT REPORT
OUTDOOR RECREATION MANAGEMENT SHORT COURSE
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

By

JAMES M. OLSEN

Recreation Unit
Pacific Northwest Region

Campground Fee Administration

USFS Region 6

February 1980

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Introduction

The Washington Office management review report for the developed recreation site activity review conducted in 1978 identified, among other issues, that issue identified as No. 7 related to the L&WCF program. That issue No. 7 states the Land and Water Conservation Fund fee program is not being administered in accordance with national direction. Several causes were identified in the report:

1. Erroneous assumption by both land and staff officers that enforcement of the fee program conflicts with the Host program.
2. Lack of commitment by line officers.
3. Supervisors are not aware of how the fee program is being administered on the ground.
4. Campground rangers are not aware of long-term effects of their daily administrative decisions.
5. Instructions are not fully understood.
6. Lack of knowledge of where and how to obtain required pay station materials.

Based upon these causes, the review team arrived at several alternatives. From these alternatives they selected an action plan to deal with the issue.

In the action plan, they stated the issue as: The Land and Water Conservation Fee program is not being administered in accordance with national direction. This is resulting in public confusion and loss of credibility of the fee program to ourselves and the public. The action program consists of three steps:

1. Require all units to follow present direction and issue citations to all violators who have had ample opportunity to pay the required fee.

2. Establish an adequate cross-reference and Forest Service Manual 2330 to all materials scattered throughout the sign handbook, poster catalog, collection officer's handbook, and Forest Service Manual 5300 pertaining to administration of the fee system.
3. Assure that all units are properly and consistently utilizing the pay station method of fee collection. This includes pay station signing design and compliance instructions.

My project attempts to investigate the situation relating to the administration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund in Region 6. It attempts to answer the questions:

1. How well do local managers believe the Land and Water Conservation Fund fee program is operating?
2. How efficient is the fee program in relationship to benefit-cost ratio?
3. Is there public confusion concerning the Land and Water Conservation Fund fee program as administered by the Forest Service in Region 6
4. Is there a loss of credibility of the fee program to ourselves and the public at Forest Service recreation sites?
5. Are instructions and procedures adequate?
6. What are the objectives of the fee program and are they being met?

Background

It may appear presumptuous for me to study a finding of the WO activity review. However, based upon the principles in some of the concepts which I acquired at the Clemson University short course in recreation management, I looked this question from several different aspects perhaps overlooked in the activity review.

The differing approach consists of an analysis of human factors taking a three-prong attack upon this ussue--the first being:

1. Literature review. This consists of a search of current literature in allied fields which relate to the law enforcement question and the human dynamics involved where the authority vested in the agency comes in contact with the recreation visitor.
2. The economics or the benefit cost relationship concerning the cost of administering the program versus the receipts from use fees.
3. The social psychological responses of employees who have the responsibility for carrying out policy and must collect the fees and explain them to the visitor at a recreation site.

This approach differs from the typical review of compliance with policy in that it examines how the procedure is being actually implemented to meet the objectives as they are understood by people within their own personal concepts of what is the function of recreation as a service to mankind.

Study Method

1. Literature review.

I utilized the Portland State University library, psychological abstracts and sociological abstracts for current literature relating to law enforcement attitudes, recreation visitors, stress, threats, determinance of conformity, and personality factors affecting success as a law enforcement agent. I utilized the Westfornet data base for a literature search using the recreation user fees, campter attitudes toward use fees, and method of collection of user fees at recreation sites for search topics.

2. Economic analysis.

Ranger Districts having fee campgrounds within Pacific Northwest Region which consists of Oregon and Washington were randomly selected to gather information. A questionnaire was sent to each one of these 10 districts. Districts were to report the amount of money collected in the 1979 season at all of the recreation sites on their ranger district. In addition, they were to, as best they could, determine and report the cost of collecting those fees.

An analysis of the reported recreation use at those same recreation sites was analyzed to determine what the expected revenue should have been if the fee program were successful at recovering the entire potential from all recreation visitors at those sites. The reported receipts and the expected receipts are compared on those ranger districts at various sites for a picture of a sample within Region 6. The purpose of this is to be able to assess the actual returns in relationship to what we might expect from those sites in terms of dollars received.

3. The human element, giving consideration to the attitudes of Forest Service administrators where these fees are collected.

This was done by sending a voluntary questionnaire to each of these 10 ranger districts. Personnel on those districts who are indirectly or directly responsible for the fee administration at the campgrounds were to complete the multiple choice questionnaire. Three of the ranger districts were selected for interviews to pursue in depth their attitudes and perceptions of the program.

4. Literature review digest.

"Stress Related Disorders and Policemen."

Essentially, the concept of stress relates to that of response to a threat or perception of a threat. This concept perceives man as a stress-perceiving organism. Our society is becoming an increasingly stressful community. Each change produces greater complexity.

"Law enforcement is not going to become easier in a culture which is changing at an incredible rate and becoming more complex with each change." The role of the policeman or the law enforcer or regulation administrator sets a man apart. It tends to isolate him from others. If stress is great enough, it creates a "them versus us" perception.

Another publication entitled, "Hyperlexis: our national disease," states that "hyperlexis is the overbundance of laws and the mechanics for their execution which currently exists in the U.S." This results in enormous dollar costs, partial paralysis of the legal system, increasing public disrespect for the law, the necessity for discretionary choice in law enforcement due to insufficient resources and inequality since those able to deal with the bureaucracy will receive fairer treatment. It asserts that "the limits on regulatory activity by the government are practially nonexistent."

A publication entitled, "Sanction, Fear and the Maintenance of Social Order" states that conformity predictors are (1) utility, and (2) fear of interpersonal loss of respect. It claims that general or legal sanctions proved to be of minor or only moderate importance. Primary determinants of conformity are the reinforcement value of a behavior, the probability of losing respect among those one knows personally, and moral commitments.

An article entitled, "How to Make Park Law Enforcement Work for You" claims that "there are three distinct types of violators with whom a park law enforcement employee is apt to come in contact." These persons are listed as (1) the accidental violator, who has no intent to violate the law and has made a human mistake; (2) the opportunist violator who leaves home with no intent to violate the law but when an opportunity presents itself, he yields to the temptation; and (3) the criminal, who leaves home with sole intent to violate the law.

The literature search has prompted me to consider the question: What are the human factors operating in the administration of recreation fees?

Unexpectedly, I found that enforcement and administration of the fee regulations is a stress occupation; those who promulgate the policy of fee compliance and administration are not as immediately aware of the threat or the potential threat as an employee who must confront the recreation visitor.

Many recreation employees perceive themselves as performers entertaining visitors. The concept of disciplining those whom he wishes to entertain is foreign to him.

Those involved in forest recreation perceive it to be a good thing; that is, good things happen on vacations. Recreation personnel wish to reinforce their perceptions of what they consider to be a desirable setting for the vacation. They consider a fee violation citation a threat, a tension producer for themselves and the visitor.

If a fee compliance method is to become completely efficient, it must be completely impersonal.

Enforcement personnel tend to overcompensate for the stress they receive during the performance of their duties in terms of withdrawal from the threat.

There is no reward for confrontation within the system. Within the employee's framework of understanding, there is a conflict of objectives. On the one hand he is to take time to explain and inform the visitor; on the other hand, he is to mechanically process the fee system.

When visitors to recreation sites are in this strange environment, they are disoriented and thereby are preoccupied with meeting their basic needs. They have achieved the meeting of basic needs at home, enabling them to venture to the recreation site but at that site they no longer are at the same level they had achieved at home. In Maslow's hierarchy of needs, they fall back to step one on the scale. They are once again encountering the challenge to meet their basic needs. Some of the things that they are concerned with are:

1. Care of their vehicle
2. Shelter
3. Food
4. Hygiene
5. Safety
6. A "feel" for their territory
7. Acquiring firewood

Paying the necessary fee is fairly low on their scale of needs.

The research leading to the recreation opportunities spectrum has advanced the concept of the recreationist as one who has an entire package of expectations as he sets forth on his vacation or outing. A predictable and consistent method of paying the required fee serves to alleviate his fears in that he does not want to be punished for an innocent mistake nor does he care to have those who are willfully violating the regulations to be allowed to take advantage of the system. The visitor is more concerned with how he is approached or how others are dealt with than whether or not a fee is paid. To sum up the literature review, we find that recreation visitors consider the fee a necessary part of the experience; however, they may reinforce the positive expectation by the type of contact they make with the representative of the agency. However, they may be "turned off" by the approach of the recreation administrator to the point where they will seek another location which reinforces their opinion.

5. Analysis of Questionnaires and Interviews. The Human Factors Involved at the Ranger District administrator level.

Surprisingly, managers of all districts surveyed strongly believe in the recreation fee program. They give high priority to the administration of campground fee collection. Where budget constraints force them to set priorities they tend to place fee collection administration right at the top. They do this because they feel it is equitable; that is, it costs money to provide services to recreationists and they believe it is only fair that those who receive the benefits should pay for them. Secondly, they recognize that it is the law, and three, they recognize that the method or the attitudes conveyed in their fee compliance contacts expresses the tone with which they convey the image of the agency. Forest managers come directly in contact with recreation visitors in contrast to other services they provide to the general unseen public. Therefore, they are particularly sensitive to the way they administer fee compliance.

The questionnaires revealed that administrators believe noncompliance to be in the range of 5 to 10% as the median response with one claiming more than 30% noncompliance and several of 0 to 5 noncompliance. They are satisfied with the level of compliance in general.

The average number of times compliance is checked at the sites is six times per week. Fifteen percent of the fees collected are collected with some form of assistance to the visitor, consisting of reminders or verbal warnings. Fee compliance checkers make on an average of three warnings per day. All but in one case have administrators been instructed to give warnings and in every case they use their own judgement as to when to give warnings. On an average, they spend 30 minutes to an hour per week going back to sites to give campers another chance. Managers agree unanimously that fee campgrounds are equitably priced or are less than fully priced. They differ widely on

their opinion of the cost of administration to collect the fee. The fee instructions are perceived to be essentially adequate, but some improvement in method of presentation is needed. They believe that the training of fee collection officers is completely adequate and that campers are generally satisfied with the way the Forest Service deals with those who do not pay the campground fees. They widely agree that campers are confused with the inconsistency of administration as they travel from one site to another. They believe that this is due to confusion between agencies because campers do not make any differentation between different levels of government. They believe that campers perceive them all to be parks. Campers are conditioned to the ranger visiting them for the collection of fee at many state parks and county facilities. They feel that campground fees should be more rigidly enforced uniformly regionwide. This means that it deserves attention. Generally, they feel that the fee collection method used by the Forest Service does not have any affect on the Forest Service image. There was one exception to that. They generally believe that fees cause campers to respect and take better care of their facilities. They were split on their attitudes about whether campers expect more because they pay or the fact that ex-campers don't relate fees to what is provided. They believe that campers seek out fee sites because they attract people who are compatible with their life style. The respondents varied on their opinion of the reliance on the judicial system to achieve compliance.

From all the responses, there were no cases where a citation was issued based upon the initial contact. The only cases in which the citation was issued for failure to pay was when the camper willfully violated and refused to pay.

From the interviews at the three ranger districts, the following attitudes were expressed.

"We are able to give the proper attention because we have manpower or human resource programs to do the maintenance which allows us some slack." "We need not be apologetic about the collection of fees. It costs money to haul garbage, provide drinking water, and clean facilities." "We have issued no citations for failure to pay camping fees. Our situation is unique. We are on a dead-end highway and we know fairly well who the campers will be even next summer, for which dates, and which unit they will camp in for the most part. We have a permanent employee who administers the developed recreation sites. He has long-term acquaintenceships with many campers. We have only one fee site on our district."

From the interviews, I gathered that managers believe that:

1. Visitors usually don't read the instructions for various reasons.
2. They are obtaining an acceptable level of compliance without citing at a reasonable cost.
3. Compliance checking duties are distasteful to employees.
4. With few exceptions, visitors attempt to comply. A heavy mechanical approach to fee compliance is over-reacting to a minority situation.
5. In one case, the managers stated "the Host program is a gimmick or a slogan." The manager recognized the need for the Host program but felt it is needed elsewhere. He believes that those people who come in contact with the public on a frequent basis are well aware of the visitor's point of view but those employees isolated from the public need the Host program.
6. The current manual policy on fee enforcement requires a less than hospitable approach to fee administration.
7. Experienced fee compliance personnel can rapidly evaluate the situation. They are able to evaluate people from indicators, such as is expressed by: Six dogs and three flat tires tells you that they may not have the money. They believe that easterners are generally unfamiliar with self-service fee payment systems. They can recognize visitors who might violate the fee system rules by their demeanor.

The districts interviewed had all come up with some innovative means of advising visitors in a hospitable manner about the fee system. They deal with some visitors more leniently than they do others, depending upon the demeanor of the visitor. The district rangers interviewed had complete trust in their recreation technician site managers. They seem to be proud of their facilities and their recreation opportunities. They appear to be independent, creative, adaptive and able to innovate to achieve objectives, but they resent policy which dictates how to achieve objectives. They see confusion and lack of uniformity stemming from conflicting direction. The conflicting direction is on the one hand to cite violators somewhat mechanically, but on the other hand to create a positive recreation social climate or setting.

When managers hire seasonal personnel for fee compliance duties, they have some difficulties. They are unable to return fee collection personnel to the same duty another season. They believe that outgoing people are desirable for fee compliance duties; however, these people have more job options open to them. They believe that the introverted person attempts to avoid contacts but when he has no alternative but to be confrontive strikes a negative response to the visitor which results in a reversion to the "upholder of the law" role resulting in defiance and consequently threats and stress which reinforces distaste for fee administration even further.

Where managers consider fee administration responsibility as an opportunity to explain the attributes of the site and the service provided, they relieve the associated stress.

Managers would like more latitude in hiring so that they could acquire the personality traits which relate to success in fee compliance staff.

On one ranger district which has a high level of compliance and receives considerable use from out of state, they have issued no citations during the life of the fee program in the Forest Service. The campground personnel have been permanent employees who have been on the district for at least 12 years. They believe that there are three kinds of people as stated in the article in the literature review. They believe that 75% to 80% will do anything to comply with the fee program to pay their fee. The remaining group needs some encouragement. They use a preprinted notice attached to a fee envelope requesting the camper to place the envelope with his money in the deposit vault. They believe that the campground Host has a strong affect on the success of the fee program through his intimate contact with the campers.

The managers strongly feel that the Land and Water Conservation Fees must be returned to the site where they are collected to properly motivate the campers and the recreation personnel responsible for the site. They are concerned that the recreation funds are not being returned to do campground maintenance and operation. Managers believe there is a strong relationship between fee collection success and the incentive of having the money available to maintain the sites.

On the ranger district where they employ seasonal personnel to carry out the fee system, they have considerably more problems with the fee program. These seasonal employees did cleanup at the recreation sites as well as acted as compliance checkers. The compliance checkers in this case were not given the authority to issue any citations. They must contact a person at the ranger station who must travel to the campground, then investigate the case. The recreation managers were not aware of what the fee compliance procedures were on adjacent districts or forests. They thought that there was need for an exchange of that information.

The personnel who administer the fee program and have authority to issue citations look upon citations as a last resort. They want the authority to issue citations where there is a willful violation and an outright refusal to comply. However, they don't want to issue a citation to an innocent party.

6. Economic Analysis

Throughout Region 6, the average amount spent to collect fees is 26¢ to collect each dollar. It had been suspected by some that we were spending more money to collect the fees then than the amount received. The range is from 12¢ to 93¢ to collect a dollar on the districts sampled. See Appendix for summary of the economic analysis.

Seventy-seven percent of the potential fees are being collected according to the sample survey. The sample represents $90,781 out of a Regional total of $658,847 collected in 1979. It represents 12% of the ranger districts which have fee campgrounds and 17.7% of the 231 fee sites in Region 6. The data is dependent upon accurate reporting of visitor use at the sites.

Contrary to our expectations, we found that three of the eight ranger districts reporting had underestimated the amount of use at the campgrounds. When we consider the amount of money collected, if we take into account the fact that some sites are occupied by more than the typical family unit and that we possibly do not collect fees from short-term users, those that may stop in late at night and leave early in the morning, we can safely say that we are collecting about 80% or more of the potential fees in Region.

The more remote sites are those which have the lowest compliance rates, as you would expect.

7, Conclusions

The responses to questionnaires in Region 6 reinforces the Activity Review finding that "The Land and Water Conservation Fund fee program is not being administered in accordance with national direction." Ranger district administrators of the fee program consider the national direction to be out of touch with reality. The procedural steps, documentation of an adequate case, and the difficulty to prove willful violation combine to limit the use of citations to only extreme situations.

Managers consider the national direction as limiting their capacity to obtain results and achieve the best balance of multiple objectives. They see policy makers as single purposed, but the field manager lives in a world of diverse purposes with limited resources.

The fee returns are reasonably close to the anticipated receipts. There are "horror stories" of noncompliance but the sample employed here indicates a 77% average compliance over the Region.

Field managers,with some exceptions, are remarkably innovative in achieving the objectives which have been established for them. The national direction is looked upon as a hindrance to meeting objectives within the context they must operate because it is restrictively inflexible. They desire a national objective for fee collection at campgrounds employing the existing pay station self-service system.

The questionnaire solicits opinions and attitudes rather than a test of managers' knowledge of formal policy. Unsolicited comments for each query or on any aspect of the fee program would be helpful.

A questionnaire should be completed independently by District Ranger, Recreation or Resource Assistant to the Ranger, Recreation Technician(s) responsible wholly or partly for fee collection, and Collection Officer(s) as applicable on your District. Circle the one choice with which you most closely agree or is most descriptive of your sites.

A cost versus receipts form is also included for completion. Please give the best information available. Do not reconstruct payrolls, travel records, etc. Use data already compiled, if available. If not, give a careful estimate. Response need not be based on data to each question but your estimate of the situation.

Administration — If you care to comment, please do so on this questionnaire which you most closely agree.

	Estimate	Circle One
1.	Noncompliance - %	0-5, 5-10, 10-20, 20-30, 30+
2.	Average time checked per week for compliance during primary use season (June 15-Sept.3).	10+, 7-9, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1
3.	% of fees collected in which some form of assistance with payment of fees is given to campers (reminders, make change, etc.)	
4.	Number of verbal warnings given on typical compliance check of fee campgrounds - in 1 day. Written notes, warnings given on typical day.	None; 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; more than 5
5.	Have you been instructed to give warnings?	Yes ____ No ____
6.	Do you use your own judgement on when to give warnings?	Yes ____ No ____
7.	Amount of time per week you spend going back to collect fees from those you give another change.	0, 10 min.; 10-30 min.; 30 min.; 1 hr.; 1-2 hr.; 2 hr. + in this site

Price

1. The fee campgrounds are a bargain; overpriced; equitable.

Costs

1. On our District, administrative costs are reasonable in relation to the amount collected at all sites; at most sites; at some sites; at no sites.

Instructions

1. Fee instructions posted at sites:

   Instructions are okey--understandable as can be expected.
   Instructions are okey--but need some improvement.
   Instructions poor--need major improvement.
   Instructions should be completely redone.

Training

1. Fee collection officers on duty during the peak season are:

   Adequately trained--fully capable.
   Adequately trained--need some more training.
   Inadequately trained.

Perceptions of Camper's Attitudes

1. I often
   occasionally
   seldom
   never

hear campers complain that the Forest Service takes no action against campers who don't pay their fees.

2. agree
   strongly agree
   disagree
   strongly disagree

campers are confused by the inconsistency of administration they experience as they travel from unit to unit.

Managers Attitudes

1. In your opinion, the fee campgrounds on your District are:

___ under priced
___ over priced
___ fairly priced

2. Payment of campground daily use fees should be:

___ more rigidly enforced uniformly Regionwide.
___ enforced at the discretion of the manager.
___ less rigidly enforced uniformly Regionwide.
___ left alone as we did it last year.

3. The method of fee collection (envelope, unmanned):

___ damages the image portrayed by the Forest Services.
___ creates a business-like image for Forest Service recreation management.
___ has no effect on Forest Service image.

4. Charging fees for use of Forest Service campgrounds causes most campers to:

___ respect and take better care of facilities where the fee is imposed.
___ feel that they can leave a dirty camp unit because they pay a fee for it.
___ has no effect on respect and care for facilities.

5. Campers:

___ expect more because they pay.
___ expectation of campers not related to fee.

6. Campers largely:

a. Agree Disagree Seek out fee sites because they want services fee sites provide.
b. Agree Disagree Avoid fee sites because of the unmanned system of fee collection
c. Agree Disagree Seek out fee sites because these sites attract a more considerate type camper.

7. Agree strongly
Agree
Disagree
Disagree strongly

Collecting of fees is proper but the unmanned envelope system places too much reliance on the judicial system to ensure compliance

8. Agree strongly
   Agree
   Disagree
   Disagree strongly

With the recreation experience demands we experience during the peak season, it is unreasonable to devote the effort needed to carry out the prescribed fee payment enforcement policy.

(one for each District)

Cost versus receipts from recreation use fees

_____ Ranger District

Fee Campground	Method of Determination (check one)		Total 1979 Cost to Collect Fees $	Method of Determination (check one)		Total 1979 Receipts $
	Estimate	From Records		Estimate	From Records	

Use the best information you have.

Check the method of determining dollar amount by campground for costs and receipts.

Forest _____

District _____

Name of respondent _____

Working Title _____

Season on this District _____

Seasons in recreation management on this District _____

Campground Fee Collections
Calculation of Expected Returns Based On Reported Use/Capacity Ratio Versus Amount Actually Collected

Site Name	RIM Report of Occupancy Percent of Theoretical Capacity 1979	No. of Units	Fee Days In Season	Daily Fee	1979 Amount Actually Collected	1979 Amount Potentially Collectible Upon RIM % of Theoretical Cap.
McKENZIE RANGER DISTRICT - WILLAMETTE NF						
McKenzie Bridge	48.38%	31	120	$2	$ 1,124	$ 3,599
Horse Creek	12.61%	21	120	$2	171	635
Paradise	26.25%	88	120	$3	6,829	8,316
Trail Bridge	17.79%	47	120	$2	1,178	2,006
Ice Cap Creek	78.43%	24	120	$2	1,763	4,517
Cold Water Cove	57.14%	35	120	$3	6,118	7,200
Big Lake	58.03%	30	120	$3	3,025	6,267
TOTAL		62% of theoretical anticipated collections			$20,208	$32,540
STEAMBOAT RANGER DISTRICT - UMPQUA NF						
Horseshoe Bend	8.99%	36	139	$2	$1,839.91	$ 900
		204% of theoretical anticipated collections				
NACHES RANGER DISTRICT - WENATCHEE NF						
Cotton Wood	38.37%	16	100	$2		$ 1,227
Sawmill Flat	30.58%	38	100	$2		2,324
Kaner Flat	7.98%	90	100	$2		1,436
Cougar Flat	73.73%	14	93	$2		1,919
Bumping Lake	43.24%	39	100	$2		3,372
Indian Flat	55.71%	11	93	$2		1,139
Lodge Pole	46.03%	32	93	$2		2,739
Hellscrossing	25.32%	20	100	$2		1,012
TOTAL					$ 9,533	$15,168
		63% of theoretical anticipated collections				

Campground Fee Collections
Calculation of Expected Returns Based On Reported Use/Capacity Ratio Versus Amount Actually Collected

Site Name	RIM Report of Occupancy Percent of Theoretical Capacity 1979	No. of Units	Fee Days In Season	Daily Fee	1979 Amount Actually Collected	1979 Amount Potentially Collectible Upon RIM % of Theoretical Cap.
BAKER RIVER RANGER DISTRICT - MT. BAKER-SNOQUALMIE NF						
Horseshoe Cove	26.31%	38	120	$3	$ 4,420.99	$ 3,600
Panorama Pt.	40.76%	16	120	$3	3,053.10	2,348
TOTAL					$ 7,474.09	$ 5,948
		126% of theoretical anticipated collections				
BLUE RIVER RANGER DISTRICT - WILLAMETTE NF						
Delta	20.34%	43	120	$3		$ 3,148
French Pete	32.26%	16	120	$3		1,858
TOTAL					$ 3,900	$ 5,006
		78% of theoretical anticipated collections				
BEAR SPRINGS RANGER DISTRICT - MT. HOOD NF						
Oak Fork	65.21%	47	123	$2	$ 5,810	$ 7,539
Hoodview	68.92%	46	123	$2	3,130	7,798
Cone Creek	47.40%	59	123	$2	2,992	6,164
Frog Lake	54.48%	33	109	$2	2,492	3.919
Clear Lake	40.36%	28	123	$2	2,165	2,780
Bear Springs	12.68%	50	123	$2	871	1,559
Clackamas Lake	3.28%	47	123	$2	154	378
TOTAL					$17,164	$30,138
		57% of theoretical anticipated collections				

Campground Fee Collections
Calculation of Expected Returns Based On Reported Use/Capacity Ratio Versus Amount Actually Collected

Site Name	RIM Report of Occupancy Percent of Theoretical Capacity 1979	No. of Units	Fee Days In Season	Daily Fee	1979 Amount Actually Collected	1979 Amount Potentially Collectible Upon RIM % of Theoretical Cap.
UNITY RANGER DISTRICT - WALLOWA-WHITMAN NF						
Oregon	46.56%	11	123	$2		$ 235
Wetmore	25.40%	24	123	$2		1,500
Yellow Pine	21.81%	41	123	$2		2,199
TOTAL					$ 883,57	$ 3,934
		22% of theoretical anticipated collections				
WALDPORT RANGER DISTRICT - SIUSLAW NF						
Tillicum Beach				$3	$20,844	$17,939
Cape Perpetua	24.37			$3	5,955	4,138
Rock Creek	29.06			$3	2,980	1,800
TOTAL					$29,77?	$23,877
		125% of theoretical anticipated collections				

APPENDIX

1. Questionnaire--sample forms
2. Campground fee collections--district summaries
3. Interview transcripts (not included with this report but in data file)
4. Completed questionnaire from 10 ranger districts, 26 responses (not included with this report but in data file)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Recreationist's attitudes toward user fees: management implications. McCurdy, Dwight R.,Journal of Forestry, October 1970

Setting User Fees and Charges. Rockwood, Linn R. , Parks and Recreation, March 1978

U.S.A. Federal Outdoor Recreation Fees. Udall, S.L., USDI Monograph, USGPO, 1967

User Payment for Recreational Opportunities Policy Analysis. USDA, Forest Service, June 1979, Dahl, J.R.

Federal Recreation Fees - 1978. HCRS, USDI, A Report to Congress. 1978

How to make park law enforcement work for you, Harmon, Larry C., Parks and Recreation, December 1979

A manual of wildlife conservation. Teague, Richard D. 1978

Stress related disorders in policemen. Haynes, W.D. 1978

Damned if they do and damned if they don't. Klein, H.T. 1968, Crown Publishing Co.

Hyperlexis, our national disease. Mannings, B.

Santion, fear and the maintenance of social order, Tittle, Charles R. Social Forces 1977

Labelling theory and criminology - an assessment. Willford, Charles. Social problems, February 1975

The Role of Fees in Campers' Decisions, LaPage, W.F., 1968. USFS Research Paper NE-118

Activity Review (O&M of developed recreation sites in public sector - FY '78) July 5, 1979, Memorandum. Hilman, J.B.